

rivers are in danger.

Further, respondents cite lack of time and lack of awareness of the problem as the major reasons they are not more personally involved in protecting and conserving rivers.

The paragraphs that follow provide a slightly more detailed summary of the findings.

## Americans have a low River IQ

The survey shows that Americans are profoundly unaware of the impact human actions have on rivers and what constitutes the greatest impacts to water resources.

✓ Although we all live in watersheds, 44% of those asked could not define the term. In fact, according to the study, 65% of all

*See "IQ" on page 2*

public of the possible danger and local officials posted signs at bridges and access points along the river, environmental scientists were busy collecting samples from the contaminated water for analysis. It may be a while, however, before the extent of damage to the river or the lake is fully known, said Don Ostler, director, Utah Division of Water Quality.

# Utah NPS Allocations Proposed for 2002

Faced with \$11 million in proposals and \$1.6 million in projected funds to divvy out, The Utah Nonpoint Source (NPS) Task Force Workgroup made its fiscal year 2002 Section 319 funding recommendations to the full task force in late August. While EPA does not yet have an approved 2002 budget, the projected funding level is based on last year's allocation.

"This was the most competitive year the [319] program has experienced," said Mike Reichert, Utah Division of Water Quality. "Several big project proposals were deemed not eligible or a low priority at this time."

Two of the proposals totaled about \$8 million. They were not funded at all. Several other large, medium and small

projects were not funded at all. Still, other projects were funded at a level less than requested.

## The Big Winners

One project actually was approved to receive more money than was requested. A \$164,000 proposal to continue Utah's Animal Feeding Operation (AFO) assessment process was cut to \$100,000. But \$70,700 in unused FY 2001 funds were rerouted to that project for a grand total of \$170,700, \$6,700 more than requested.

Other big winners include a proposal to develop a total maximum daily load (TMDL) plan for

the Otter Creek Watershed, which was proposed for \$70,900 and received \$70,000. The agricultural watershed improvement program sponsored by the Utah Farm Bureau Federation was fully funded at \$95,600. A continuation of the Cub River Watershed TMDL implementation project (requested \$150,000 and received \$148,700), and the Upper Bear River demonstration project (fully funded at \$36,400) also fared well in the Utah approval process.

## Other Proposals

In all, eight proposals did not

*See "NPS" on page 2*

Sig  
fisl  
Riv  
Tre

po  
inc  
oth  
the

die  
of  
the  
cal

Se

L  
F  
K  
S  
U  
R  
J  
T

whole geographic area may have been wise. Without vision, the people perish," Jenkins wrote.

Still, he said, the law only requires him to test the decision for reasonableness.

"The alternatives chosen for consideration as to the defined project have a rational footing, and thus were not arbitrary nor capricious, even though other alternatives could have reasonably been considered, and the agencies could have produced a better product."

While the Sierra Club has vowed to press on with the appeals process, many observers agree that the "reasonable test" was hard to beat.

according to the judge. But Jenkins said he could not substitute his own judgement for the state's. He said that the Clean Water Act does favor the protection of wetlands and water, but the courts are required to give "due deference" to government agencies.

Within a couple of weeks of the decision, The Sierra Club and Mayor Anderson filed an appeal in federal court.

Though the legal wrangling will continue for at least a while, most experts believe the state will ultimately win and get to build its highway.



*Differing opinions about the fate and importance of wetlands in the path of the project are a continuing source of controversy. The court ruling won't end the controversy.*

Great Salt Lake Resource Management Plan, a comprehensive program to conserve the lake's resources.

Clarke has served as executive director of the Utah Department of Natural Resources since 1998. Before that, she served as the department's deputy director, starting in 1993. With nearly two-thirds of

## State Sells Bird Refuges, Norton Flies

In an effort to signal that the skies are once again friendly, many Bush Administration cabinet members took to the air Friday, September 28, 2001 to do regional business around the country.

Interior Secretary Gale Norton's business was here in Utah, as she signed an agreement with Utah Governor Mike Leavitt to receive 74,000 acres of state controlled land within the federal Bear River Bird Refuge. In exchange for the land and all its petroleum and natural gas rights, the state will get \$15 million from the federal government.

The agreement is a amicable way to end a dispute that dates back almost to the 1928 creation of the waterfowl management area west of Brigham City.

"We've avoided litigation," Norton



*The Staheli family corn maze is the shape of the state of Utah and is filled with shapes including the Utah beehive.*

It's been a battle cry at the Utah Department of Agriculture and Food for years: watershed protection is easier on well-managed farm and ranch land than in suburbs and in city streets.

From a watershed protection perspective it is easier to work with one farmer to manage a 250-acre farm properly than it is to work with 700-800 home owners on the same amount of land. That's just one reason UDAF employees promote agricultural land preservation and protection.

If you're wondering what all the above philosophy has to do with the photos on this page, the answer is simple. It's one thing to say that it would be great to preserve some farm land in every community and quite another to make it economically viable. That is especially true in areas that are experiencing a lot of growth and rapidly increasing property

entertainment business, Staheli should be able to recoup the cost of development, promotion and staffing of the maze. Beyond that, the 14-acre field should yield more cash as

an amusement attraction than as any other type of agricultural crop. As a bonus, most of the 14 acres--as much as 90-95 percent--will leave usable silage corn that can be used as cattle feed.

For Staheli, the corn maze project is a family affair. Staheli grew the corn all summer. He and his wife Katherine participate in the operation of the maze, which is run mostly by their son Burke and his wife Lonette. Staheli's other children, his siblings and their children all play roles in the business.

"There's no way Ralph could have done it if everyone hadn't pitched in," said Katherine Staheli.

In late September, 2001, while the Utah Nonpoint Source conference was being held in neighboring St. George. The Staheli's hosted a community charity event for the Red Cross September 11th fund.

The patriotic evening included hundreds of American flags and red, white and blue balloons. Just before sunset, Staheli's daughter, Sherrie

*She  
Spe  
eve  
wa.*



*Local scouts, Staheli family members, a local race participant in the event that raised money for the*

**Meeting Theme: Epa's Role, the Pace/schedule for Development of TMDLs, and NPDES Permitting Pre and Post TMDL**

Topics to be discussed include: How can EPA most effectively support and ensure state TMDL development?; requirements for EPA action in response to states' action or inaction; schedules for development and implementation of TMDLs; NPDES permitting in impaired waters prior to the establishment of a TMDL; and implementing TMDLs in NPDES permits, including the schedule and role of states and EPA in issuing these permits.

**Date: Nov 7-8, 2001**

**Time: 1-6 p.m. on Nov 7 and 8:00 a.m. - noon on Nov 8.**

**Location: Atlanta Capitol Plaza Hotel, 450 Capitol Avenue, SW, Atlanta, GA. Phone: (404) 591-2000.**

**4. TMDL Listening Session, Oklahoma City, OK**

**Meeting Theme: Listing Impaired Waters**

Topics to be discussed include: timing: how often should the Section 303(d) list be submitted to EPA? Scope: Should the reporting requirements for Section 305 (b) and Section 303 (d) be integrated into a single report? List credibility: What steps should be taken to ensure credible lists of impaired waters? Data and information: What can be done to improve data and information available to support listing decisions?

**Date: Nov 15-16**

**Time: 1-6 p.m. on Nov 15 and 8:00 a.m. - noon on Nov 16.**

**Location: Hilton Oklahoma City Northwest, 2945 Northwest Expressway, Oklahoma City, OK. Phone (405) 848-4811**

**5. Washington, DC wrapup**

**Date: Dec 11, 2001**

**Time: 8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.**

**Location: Wyndham Washington, DC, 1400 M St. NW, Washington, DC. Phone: (202) 429-1700**

The 2001 Utah Nonpoint Source (NPS) Water Quality Conference was a successful mix of training, touring and traditional conference sessions.

Held in St. George, UT for the first time, this year's NPS conference featured only one day traditional conference sessions--two plenary sessions and two concurrent presentation sessions--along with a half day tour and a day's worth of watershed committee training spread over two days. In all, the three day conference was well received.

Plenary speakers Jim Cox, National Association of State Conservation Agencies, and Dr. Earl Rogers, Utah Department of Agriculture and Food informed the audience with their timely and important topics.

Cox, who works in Washington D.C., updated conference participants about the Farm Bill, concentrated animal feeding operation (CAFO) rules, and total maximum daily load (TMDL) rules. The TMDL rule, which is currently in the middle of an 18-month review and revision process by EPA was a large part of Cox's focus.

Dr. Rogers, who recently spent a